

WBK
B395a
1848

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



FOUNDED 1836

WASHINGTON, D.C.

ALLOPATHY, HAHNEMANNISM,

AND

RATIONAL HOMŒOPATHY.

COMPILED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. GRIESSELICH,
PHYSICIAN TO THE STAFF OF THE ARMY, EDITOR OF THE "HYGEIA," ETC., ETC., ETC.

BY

A. C. BECKER, M.D.

NEW-YORK:
WILLIAM RADDE, 322 BROADWAY.

1848.

W B K

B 395 a

1848.

Rec L 85-32-12

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848, by

WILLIAM RADDE,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New-York.

P R E F A C E .

THE following pages have been compiled and translated by me from the writings of Dr. L. Griesselich, an eminent practitioner in Germany, physician to the staff of the army, and editor of the "*Hygea*," a journal which he has conducted with marked ability for fourteen years, giving evidence of his scientific attainments, practical information, and extensive experience.

As the organ of a liberal school, which is already very numerous and rapidly increasing, both in Europe and in this country, he deserves to be heard in opposition to Hahnemann and his stringent disciples.

This liberal, or rational school, according to Dr. Rummel, believes "that in the majority of cases, Homœopathy cures more readily, more pleasantly, and often with more certainty, than the old-school medicines, and also without entailing evil after-consequences; but that, at the same time, it is yet in its infancy, greatly needing faithful and careful cultivation, for the purposes of gaining more universal recognition, and more certainty in the practical application of its principles.

"That its theory contains the germ of perfectibility, but is not free from imperfection, and leaves many problems as yet unsolved.

"This school does not look upon Homœopathy as the only true method in the healing art, and does not reject Allopathy as worthless.

“Whoever has become practically acquainted with Homœopathy, must concede to her the merit of being in most cases the best method of cure ; but it does not necessarily follow that the others should be altogether abandoned.

“The previous good does not become bad, because something better has been discovered.

“Though, strictly speaking, an amalgamation of both methods of cure be impossible, yet the physician is fully warranted in resorting to either, as dictated by his judgment, and the circumstances of the case.”

This school numbers amongst its adherents many distinguished men, who, regardless of sneers on the one hand, and wholesale denunciations on the other, steadily and fearlessly pursue the course dictated to them by their judgment, and their honest convictions ; less intent upon a bigoted adherence to a creed, and the promulgation of a system, than upon a conscientious consideration of their duty to the patient.

A. C. BECKER.

NEW-YORK, January 1, 1848.

No. 3, Eighth Avenue.

INTRODUCTION.

As we see sectarianism in the Church, and party spirit in the State, so also do we find dissension in the medical ranks.

On the one side we perceive implicit faith in authorities, a reverence for everything ancient, an exaggerated conservatism, which attempts, at any price, to transmit the accumulations of the past to the future; on the other, a contempt for authorities, an impulse for advancement, and a disposition to overthrow existing institutions.

In the extremes, the former leads to fanaticism, the latter to infidelity.

The same state of things is becoming very manifest in medicine: on the one side, a blind confidence in the art, on the other, none at all; on the one side, a petrification of doctrines, which are taught as if they were unimpeachable truths; on the other, a neglect of, and even contempt for, the results of laborious study and long experience.

Midway between fanaticism and infidelity lies the path of true faith; but only in matters of faith.

Medicine, however, is not one of these. In medicine we must be guided by individual judgment, by close observation, and by experience.

What has been noticed at the bed-side, has not always been intelligently observed; nor has all that has been observed, been confirmed by subsequent experience.

False conclusions have often been drawn from, so-called, experience and observation, and undue credit has been given to the action of medicines; thus, through the medium of ignorance or prejudice, thousands of "cases," pretending to be testimony

in favor of art and artists, testify merely to the power of ever-active nature.

These observations, applicable to medicine in general, apply equally to that branch of it which has been founded by Hahnemann. He overthrew the old idols, but with them—in his enthusiasm for his own doctrine and theories, and goaded by the opposition he encountered—he overshadowed many valuable and time-honored truths.

But as the number of those, who recognise the principle "*similia similibus curantur*" to be founded upon a law of nature, increased in strength, doubts grew up with regard to the theories Hahnemann had built upon the fundamental principle, thus forming the commencement of that agitation which has since continued to exist down to the present time, and which will continue to exist, so long as various theories are called in question; an agitation concerning which the strict followers of Hahnemann—who frown upon this spirit of inquiry and investigation—are very sensitive.

ALLOPATHY, HAHNEMANNISM,
AND
RATIONAL HOMŒOPATHY.

To the inquiring mind there can be no doubt, that in many respects the healing art is very imperfect.

We are firmly imbued with the necessity of a change for the better.

We are quite as much convinced, that Homœopathy, as introduced by Hahnemann—though deserving full credit for its fundamental principle, “*similia similibus curantur*,” as paving the way for a reform, when rightly understood—is greatly in need of a radical change in its details, if it would aspire to gain its great object, and to obtain the full respect of the profession.

Extravagance or ignorance only can glorify the present state of medical science; blind followers only can extol Hahnemannism, which, though excellent in cardinal points, is often imperfect in their practical application.

The following propositions contain our

CREED.

1. *The healing art requires a critical sifting of its fundamental principles. The collateral sciences are far in advance of therapeutics.*

However high the collateral sciences may stand, they have exercised but a limited influence on practical medicine.

Physiology is the nucleus of natural sciences, and from it the various branches of the healing art radiate.

Though we cannot discover the nature of life, or disclose its origin, we can recognise it by its manifestations, and should search diligently for its laws.

If we can once arrive at a distinct comprehension of the laws of health, we shall approach more nearly to those which govern disease; and in proportion to our discovery of the principles which *preserve health*, and of those which *cause disease*, and to our clear perception of the circumstances under which this change takes place, shall we acquire a knowledge of medicinal powers, and of their practical application.

2. *In order to effect a reformation, limits must be drawn to speculation, which too often, in the healing art, degenerates into arbitrary assertion, and illusion.*

3. *One main cause of the actual state of medical science may be found in the manner in which it is, in many instances, taught and cultivated. A love of systematizing, and a want of minute and intelligent observation, are fundamental faults.*

4. *Medical associations contain the germ of autocracy, introducing a species of nepotism into medicine.*

5. *Owing to want of unanimity, to selfishness and narrow-mindedness amongst physicians, the profession receives less respect from the public than is due to their science, or than is desired by themselves.*

6. *What is denominated "rational medicine" has no existence, but is rather, more or less, irrational.*

7. *Very few traces of the Hippocratic healing art are to be found in the present, so-called, "rational medicine."*

8. *That healing art, which rests on general indications, is the great highway of routinism, and has no affinity to the "ratio," but, on the contrary, a very strong one to the hypothetical and the arbitrary.*

Of late it has not unfrequently been conceded, that Homœopathy has discovered specific remedies; a concession emanating from a belief in the existence of fixed specific diseases, which after all, are but few. But the old school was totally unable to discover many such remedies, because its mode of procedure was erroneous. Its researches were confined to the sick-bed, and the observations of others on the healthy were disregarded.

Homœopathy made it a rule to test the effects of drugs on the healthy; Allopathy on the sick. Hypothesis filled up the gap in the completion of the system of the latter. Not being cognizant of the proximate, special relations, it became a surrogate to hold on to generalities, which was all the easier, because the knowledge of these general relations of drugs to the organs, ap-

peared to be more conformable to the established views on the nature of diseases ; thus, in cases of real inflammation, venesection suggested itself ; or, in debility, tonics. The fundamental error laid in this, that those who considered such cases to be “real inflammation,” or “real debility,” supported their views with as good arguments as those who opposed them. This gave rise to diversity of opinions and systems, and the consequent contradictory treatment of the most common diseases, which frequently would have done better without any medical interference.

9. *Hahnemann deserves credit for having drawn attention to the necessity of a reform in medical science, and of having materially contributed towards it.*

We hope not to be misunderstood in giving Hahnemann due credit for some things, whilst contradicting him in many. We are led to do so by a thorough and honest conviction of the truth of the fundamental principle, “*similia similibus*,” and of the untenableness of the system he built upon that foundation. A system it is, but it must be purged and purified ; and it is to be hoped, that his principle will then appear in a far better light than it does now, when the truth can hardly be distinguished amongst the errors, excepting by an intimate knowledge of the whole course of the doctrine, which course has not unfrequently been—a labyrinth.

10. *This reform, so far as Hahnemann is concerned, may be found in the doctrine of Homœopathy ; and is based upon the few main principles laid down in that doctrine, which principles cannot be upset either by theory or practice.*

If the true be emancipated from the false, we may reasonably expect, that many of the opponents of Homœopathy will become its adherents. The true propositions need only to be explained to become an anchor to reason. No dogmatic theory in unison with the prevailing doctrines need to be built up ; but a theory in accordance with the knowledge and attainments of the present day, which will convert the opponent, who investigates Homœopathy in his study only, by the clearness of its principles. It is quite another thing with the *argumentum ad hominem*, but this cannot be carried through by Homœopathic, still less by Hahnemannian theories.

The question suggesting itself, then, is : Can the homœopathic doctrine stand the test of practice ? The only reply to this is a reference to numerous well-substantiated facts.

That such a reply can be given, is Hahnemann's great merit.

Whether it can be carried out, time will show.

The natural inference from such a reply is, that a change for the better is being accomplished by Homœopathy, but we desire thereby to be understood as meaning Homœopathy divested of Hahnemannian theories.

The truths of the Homœopathic doctrine may be embraced in :—

- a. The principle "similia similibus curantur;"
- b. The search for the specific relation between the drug, and the organ in the healthy ;
- c. Consequent indication in disease ;
- d. The efficacy of comparatively small doses ;
- e. The exhibition of simple substances.
- f. The abiding of the effects of each medicine ;
- g. Attention to dietetics.

11. *Hahnemannian medicine (Hahnemannism) and Homœopathy have of late years become two distinct systems, and should, as such, be clearly distinguished.*

We deem it requisite to say this openly, and to repeat it, with the view of advancing science, and rendering it the property of all whose intentions are honest. Homœopathy, as it is presented in the Organon of Hahnemann, we designate as "Hahnemannism;" we repudiate all sympathy or connection with his system, as such ; and devote ourselves to the "specific" healing art contained in "Homœopathy proper." Hahnemann has, in many things, departed from his original better course, and entangled himself in a mass of contradictions, which can be respected only by the immature.

It is possible to be a "Homœopath" without being a "Hahnemannian," and we repudiate the latter appellation, as we do Hahnemannism.

12. *Hahnemannism is an aggregate of truth and untruth, and cannot, in its totality, be adopted by any scientific physician.*

13. *What Hahnemann's stringent disciples denominate "PURE" Homœopathy, does not deserve that name, in so far as it is intended to include all the chimeras and inconsistencies of Hahnemann.*

Of late much has been said of "pure Homœopathy," and the name of "pure" Homœopathists has been claimed by those who implicitly follow the directions of the Organon. In contradis-

inction to them, a mixed, or eclectic sect, is often alluded to. From what has been said, and is yet to be said, the inference may be drawn as to what is to be thought of those differences. We are of opinion, that everybody should act up to his honest convictions; but we likewise believe, that many of the so-called Homœopathists have no conviction at all, but accept in good faith what has been preached to them, and act partly from habit, and partly from imitation, with a comfortable belief that this is "conviction."

14. *Homœopathy has, as yet, not been so far perfected, that its disciples may always, and in all cases, eschew other modes of treatment, although Homœopathy does excel all others in most cases.*

However much we may respect honest conviction and consequent action, though it be at variance with our own, we do not consider the so-called pure Homœopathy that "*panacea*" which it is proclaimed to be; on the contrary, we believe that it has been ushered into the world with the same human infirmities which attend all systems pretending to be the "*only true*" ones. We also believe that Homœopathy is not yet so perfected as to be independent of some few simple therapeutical agents of the old school. How, and when, these are to be called into account, must be left to the judgment of the individual physician.

15. *Homœopathy is that method which employs specific remedies for the removal of disease.*

Much controversy has taken place with regard to "specific" remedies; some consider them as very desirable, others again look upon them as paving the way to empiricism.

This difference of opinion appears to us to originate in a want of a proper understanding of the term.

Homœopathy claims to use specific remedies, and its opponents say it cannot do so, because it does not recognise specific diseases.

Whilst the old school designates diseases with specific names, and, on the whole, recognises a nosological frame-work according to species, genus and class, in which involuntarily the principles of action at the bed-side are reflected—Homœopathy insists upon the necessity of regarding every case of disease singly, and individually.

The former *generalizes*; the latter *individualizes*.

Nosology cannot be systematized like botany or zoology, nor

can it be said, on the other hand, that a given case of disease is of such a nature as has never been observed before, or is to happen again; if this were true, we should require—in order to meet the endless number of diseases—an endless number of remedies, the knowledge of which would be impossible. The thing is true in one point of view only: there are diseases which can be recognised again by their leading symptoms, but which appear variously modified by the constitution, temperament, etc., of the patient, and by other extraneous circumstances; and these modifications exercise an influence in the selection of a remedy.

The idea of the “specific,” then, includes that of the individually-appropriate, but may, in the broader sense of the term, be extended to pathological family-forms of certain organs and systems; thus, aconite acts specifically on the increased activity of the vascular system. From the manner in which—according to a series of observations—this action becomes apparent in various organisms, the physician concludes, in a given case of disease, that aconite is the appropriate remedy. Therefore, to be “specific,” the remedy must stand in the nearest relationship to the disease, which may be compared with the relation between the spark and the tinder. Thus the French physicians use, instead of the term “specificity,” that of “appropriation.”

16. *Specific medicines do not bear relation to specific diseases in the sense of the old school. Every case of disease is to be individualized, and treated with remedies which bear a specific relation to the pathological condition of the diseased organ.*

17. *The term “specific” means, therefore, the mutual relation between the medicine and the disease.*

18. *This method of applying remedies is the most direct and speedy in action, and requires a very minute knowledge of both disease and remedy. It is the shortest and surest road towards effecting a cure, whereas, by every other method, we can accomplish that object only in an indirect and circuitous manner.*

19. *The term “similia similibus curantur,” expresses the mutual relation between the disease and the medicine; but the explanation which Hahnemann gives of it is very arbitrary, and conveys false impressions regarding the curative process.*

This proposition is intended to be understood thus: the remedy to be given against a disease should be that one which would produce on the healthy body a similar disease. But this

word "*similar*" is a stumbling-block, and every one who has not thoughtlessly adopted Hahnemann's theory, must ask himself, wherein this "similarity" consists? According to our views, there should be "*conformity*," not similarity, between the symptoms produced by the medicine, and those of the disease. Without entering into physiological and pathological arguments, we merely remark, that Hahnemann committed a great mistake in building upon the above true principle of s. s. c., the theory, that the specific remedy must produce a new artificial diseased state, "*similar*" to the then existing natural disease, and by being more violent than the latter, extinguish it.

His next assumption, that the artificial disease, after having accomplished this object, disappears of itself, is likewise hypothetical. He considers this theory to be proven by the so-called homœopathic exacerbation; but it is to be borne in mind, that this exacerbation seldom occurs, after appropriate doses; that in most cases it is an aggravation of the disease; its occurrence standing in no direct connection with the medicine, and that it would be beyond the power of the physician to control this exacerbation so as to prevent its becoming dangerous. The usual acceptance of the term we deem to be a dangerous thing in practice, because nobody knows how long it is to exist, and how long to be waited for. We read of such "*exacerbations*" having existed for days, but this looks to us very much like pathological ignorance of the course and phenomena of disease. In the so-called "*exacerbations*," there has not been a sufficient line drawn between

1. The symptoms of the existing disease, and
2. The appearance of entirely new ones.

We have further to remark, that in either of those circumstances, or both together—after the appropriate remedy has been given—we may ascribe the phenomena to a morbidly-increased power of re-action. Moreover, we must bear in mind, that the so-called homœopathic aggravation is very often not succeeded by any improvement, but that the disease runs on in its course.

The simple fact is, that the "*Organon*" of Hahnemann requires a thorough purification, which should commence with the pathological part.

20. *Taking the principle of "similia similibus curantur" for the corner-stone, we should re-build the theory of Homœopathy. Hahnemann's propositions are, for the most part, without found-*

dation, and his *Organon* is full of ambiguities, inconsistencies and errors, which very much obscure the valuable matter it contains.

21. *There are various ways of curing.*

We have already alluded above to the method of derivation or revulsion, and abstain from criticizing other methods, or entering upon their merits and demerits. To say that the old school has no method, is exaggeration. We call to mind, first, the *antagonistic* method, which, by shifting the field of reaction from the seat of disease to another place, does just what Hahnemann proposes doing, *i. e.*, to make the sick sicker, with the view of curing—it is a method which originates a morbid condition in a healthy organ, whereas, Hahnemann would increase the morbid state of the diseased organ.

The *antipathic* method also often leads to a favorable result.

Though we must confess that, especially in inflammation of vital parts, the revulsive method is less to be relied upon than the specific, in gaining its object, and is attended with greater loss to the constitution, yet it cannot be denied, that that method is founded in nature. Nature points to various ways for curing the diseased organism.

22. *What Hahnemann calls the Allopathic method, is an aggregate of methods; and his description of it, though correct in most points, is incorrect in many particulars.*

23. *The antagonistic or revulsive method is positively curative, and relies upon exciting activity in a healthy organ, which stands in a polar relation to the diseased organ.*

24. *The antipathic, resting upon the principle “contraria contrariis curantur,” opposes the morbid process in the diseased organ by a contrary process, and thus attempts to remove the original disease. This is a method also.*

25. *What has been introduced under the name of “Isopathy” is a wretched web of confusion and vapid analogy, with some ill-digested truth.*

The facts on which this hallucination pretends to rest, are few, and if rightly understood, go to prove the homœopathic principle.

26. *The foundation of all methods should emanate from the idea of the power inherent in nature, which is subject to certain laws—ever active in a state of both health and disease.*

By vital power we mean in general the endeavor of the orga-

nism to preserve its integrity, and to shield itself against extraneous influences ; and *in particular*, the struggle of the individual organs amongst themselves, towards preserving their individuality. This common strife causes that condition, which we denominate health. The laws which govern it, belong to physiology.

The curative powers of nature, are only a modification of those just alluded to, and are owing to the changed condition of the organism ; in reality they are the same, and are very properly called the “recuperative powers of nature.” In like manner, as the healthy constitution arms itself against injurious influences, so also does the morbid constitution strive to shake off their effects.

To imagine a passive organism, is sheer nonsense.

The object of remedial agents should be to assist nature in her recuperative efforts, or to rouse this power into action if it should be dormant.

But this “*vis medicatrix naturæ*” may itself be morbidly affected by a change in its natural relation to the outer world, and to the individual organs ; it may even be destroyed ; and this accounts for the occurrence of false crises, for the sacrifice of one part to save another, etc.

Absolutely curative means cannot exist. Did we possess them, we should have the power to change death into life.

The physiologist should search for the laws which regulate the vital power ; the pathologist resting on them, searches for those which govern disease ; and the therapist should be acquainted with them all, if he would not prescribe his medicines at random.

27. *This power is called the “vital” power in the healthy, the “recuperative” in the sick. The one cannot be conceded without the other ; every physician should keep both in his mind’s eye.*

28. *Many cures are effected by the “vis medicatrix naturæ” alone.*

As yet the curative process is but little understood. We mean thereby, that the history of disease in its twofold direction, i. e. 1. when recovery takes place of itself, or 2, when brought about by medical interference, has not been sufficiently cultivated.—Few physicians appear to have a due appreciation of such a history, which may account for their unlimited confidence in their drugs. We do not here allude to investigation on the dry soil of speculation, but to inquiries governed by an accurate observa-

tion of nature, keeping equally aloof from shallow hypothesis, and empiricism.

29. *Many reported cases of cures, ascribed either to Homœopathy or Allopathy, have been in truth accomplished by the vis medicatrix naturæ, and often even in spite of bad treatment.*

30. *In order to cure by means of a specific remedy, it is not necessary first to produce an artificial similar disease, which shall master the natural, as Hahnemann thought.*

31. *The theory of homœopathic exacerbation, if considered in its totality, and especially in so far as it is intended to form the basis for the theory of creating an artificial disease, is an error.*

32. *Many diseases are thus far not susceptible of any change in their course, by means of medicines; others again yield temporarily only, and re-appear in the same or another shape.*

33. *To physiology we must look for the relation between medicinal agents and certain forms of disease in particular organs.*

34. *As physiology precedes pathology, and the latter is based on the former, so must the proving of medicine on the healthy precede the trial of drugs on the sick.*

35. *Neither the physiological nor the pathological proving alone, furnishes the physician with the sure indication for the employment of a remedy; both methods of investigation combined, form a whole, and are of equal value to the practitioner, because the experience at the bed-side must confirm the truth of that which the drug promised to accomplish, when being tried on the healthy.*

36. *All Hahnemann's proving of drugs should be repeated carefully, upon some fixed principle.*

We are not ungrateful to Hahnemann for his labors, and are as far from depreciating, as from overrating his services; but we do not believe, that much good will result, if the way he has chalked out should be pursued, in the proving of drugs. Hahnemannism gives us merely a chain of symptoms, arbitrarily arranged, without giving the entire picture and history of a drug-disease, its course, its beginning, or end; and one is apt to lose himself in an entanglement of symptoms, of which we do not know how they come, how they go, or what relation they bear to each other. We are convinced,—and experience corroborates it,—that in the actual state of the so-called “*materia medica pura*,” the selection of the really specific remedy is frequently a matter of chance.

37. *Every medicine affords us, by the totality of its action, and leading symptoms, a mirror in which the drug-disease, with its principal phenomena, is reflected. Thus materia medica has a diagnosis, as well as pathology.*

The proving of medicines should be made on a large number of persons of different age, sex and constitution; and the individuals should be thoroughly healthy. Should there be amongst any of them a latent germ for disease, the impressions made by the medicine on such individuals ought to be most carefully noted down. All the symptoms of the drug-disease should be minutely specified, and then the sum total will enable us to determine which symptoms are constant, characteristic and reliable.

Thus we may arrive at a complete totality of the effects of each drug, based on the course of a drug-disease, and on the impression made upon the several organs. It is obviously very necessary, that in those provings, all outward influences should be well considered, that no symptoms be attributed to the drug which do not belong to it; moreover, the drug should be tried in various doses, and not only on man, but on animals also.

From this it is evident, that the materia medica may have its diagnosis as well as pathology. To the latter we look for the pathognomotic signs of disease, which signs must be reflected in the drug symptoms of the specific agent.

38. *The main task of the physician is to diagnose; his next duty is to compare the phenomena of the disease with the phenomena of the drug, and to select the remedy accordingly.*

39. *The great desideratum in Homœopathic treatment is, that the remedy be the specific to the case, and that the dose be judiciously regulated. The remedy and dose should go hand in hand, if the former is to do any good.*

The degree of vital energy varies materially both in the healthy and in the sick. Whilst one constitution withstands the most violent physical and psychical influences, another is easily prostrated by the slightest. To prescribe one measure for all, would betray great want of judgment.

The question with regard to the remedy reduces itself to the "what," and the "why." The former once determined upon, the latter must be sought for according to the degree of constitutional energy, and with due reference to the affected organ.—Such blunders as the old school has been guilty of, cannot occur

in Homœopathy; the mistake which the latter is liable to make is giving "too little," not "too much," as in Allopathy.

It cannot be denied that there are constitutions affected almost by a breath; but to assume that everybody is so susceptible, and to give infinitesimal doses all round, is positively absurd.

The doses form a ladder, whose separate steps should be considered equally valuable by every physician, who would not sacrifice his patients to his prejudice. A remedy may be well chosen, and yet do no good, because the dose is inappropriate. Yet, recovery follows, and the medicine receives the credit due to nature.

Most of the uncertainty and groping in darkness, is owing to the unsatisfactory arrangement of the materia medica.

40. *The action of the rightly-chosen remedy should be promoted by appropriate dietetics.*

41. *To give a mixture of several homœopathic medicines at the same time, is a step backwards into the errors of the old school.*

The superiority of Homœopathy in giving only one medicine at a time, cannot be extolled too highly. We have no knowledge of the specific action of a mixture of medicines. To employ mixtures, is to violate fundamental laws, based on physiology; and the old school cannot demonstrate by any scientific arguments, that the mixtures are efficacious. The *result* is no proof of it, because that can be accounted for by the mixture containing an ingredient which is the appropriate specific remedy in the case. But how often do the bad effects of these Allopathic mixtures manifest themselves, by injurious effects on the constitution! All this mischief is increased by the large size of the doses, which proceeds from ignorance of the specific action of each drug. What Hahnemann says on this subject, is quite true; but many other things with which he charges Allopathy, can only have reference to abuses, not judicious uses.

In defence of these mixtures, the use of mineral waters has been brought forward, and it has been said, that the idea of simplicity is a mere supposition, as all homœopathic medicines are compositions; (for instance, the various constituent parts of vegetable juices, the sugar of milk, alcohol, etc.) further, that some of them are actual chemical mixtures, (hepar sulphuris or sulphuret of lime, for instance,) to which we reply: 1. That the mi-

neral waters should be regarded as an organic unity, whose effects are not the sum total of the powers of each ingredient considered separately; and since we are ignorant of the power which combines them into an organic unity, we must consider the *artificial* mineral waters no better than any other surrogate.

2. That our mixtures, like the above, have been experimented with, and their physiological effects been proven on the healthy.

42. *Hahnemann's remarks about the exclusive use of infinitesimal doses are both very arbitrary and dangerous in practice. His recommendation, merely to administer the 30th dilution, is dangerous advice.*

43. *In the same manner, what he says on the duration of the effects of medicine, is of little practical value.*

This law originated in Hahnemann's brain, and not in nature, and has been amply refuted by subsequent close observation. Hahnemann partially rescinded it in his instructions respecting repetition of doses.

44. *The theory on chronic diseases, and their three fundamental causes, psora, syphilis, and sycosis, cannot be saved; nor is it worth saving.*

According to Hahnemann, seven-eighths of the chronic diseases owe their origin to a positively traceable contagion of itch; and the remaining one-eighth to syphilis and sycosis; and he has in later years assumed, that acute diseases are only the blazing up, or visible evidence of what he calls latent psoras. We cannot enter here into an elaborate refutation of this extravagant theory. The injurious influences on the human organism are too numerous to admit, for a moment, of such limitation. The main causes of disease lie, in our opinion, more in a hereditary constitution, than in a disposition acquired during life.

45. *A division of remedies into psoric, antipsoric, etc., is, therefore, merely fanciful.*

46. *The whole doctrine of "potences" is a contradiction within itself, and cannot be defended. This Hahnemannian aberration has done, and is doing, incalculable injury to Homœopathy. The terms millionth, decillionth, etc., are totally inadmissible, and should be abandoned.*

This is one of the fundamental theories of *Hahnemannism*; but no satisfactory evidence to sustain it, to show that the process called "potentializing" really takes place, has been brought forward. The whole defence of this theory consists in

an arbitrary use of words, a confusion of ideas, and a wilful assumption of natural laws, which do not exist.

This question has already been amply discussed, and we will confine ourselves to a few main points.

On inquiring what is meant by potentializing, we are answered by § 269 of the Organon: "Homœopathy unfolds for her purposes the spiritual medicinal powers, (residing in the crude substances) to a hitherto unheard-of degree, by virtue of a peculiar process, thus far untried, which renders them all thoroughly efficacious, and beneficial; even those which, in their crude state, do not betray the slightest medicinal influence on the human body."

But there is a great difference between "developing" and "enhancing," *i. e.*, "potentializing."

These terms cannot be employed synonymously. Which, then, is the right term?

What we have further to say on this subject, we shall illustrate by an instance; because, to follow up this potency "theory," would be pursuing an aggregate of contradictions, and arbitrary assertions.

We will place belladonna on one side, and carbonate of lime on the other; the former in mother tincture, the latter in a pulverized state.

Nobody can reasonably pretend that, by shaking the belladonna, a power will be developed; because the tincture is already "power"-ful; still less can it be said, that this power could, and would be enhanced or increased, by being elevated to a higher potency; if so, just the reverse would occur of what Hahnemann aimed at: a *mitigation* of the medicinal powers residing in the mother tinctures, which powers "render them already unfit for general use in large doses."

Hahnemann cautions constantly against the use of *low* potences, because of their too powerful action, and yet recommends the *high*, which, according to his own theory, ought to be the more powerful of the two.

But fortunately the case is very different; they are merely *dilutions*, and it is immaterial, so far as the potentializing is concerned, whether they are shaken two, or two thousand times, as daily experience proves.

They are *diminutions* which are needed, because large doses of *specific* remedies are apt to cause too powerful a *re-action*,

which, to say the least, is unnecessary, and may prove to be injurious.

The grain of the dry "calcareo carbonica," or carbonate of lime, will have no effect in its crude state; but after having been finely triturated with some vehicle, such as sugar, or water, rendering it soluble, and capable of being assimilated, it will produce an effect on the body. This minute division allows every little particle to act; whereas the entire mass of combined particles, in the crude state, could not make an impression on the ends of the nerves. Thus, in mineral waters, can we account for the action of small quantities of apparently powerless ingredients.

By trituration, the calcarea has been transformed into another physical state, and consequently acts differently.

In this instance, likewise, no "potentializing" has taken place, in Hahnemann's sense of the term; these "crude substances," he says, "have not the slightest medicinal power;" but "potentializing" pre-supposes a "potence," and where there is none, it cannot be "potentialized" or "enhanced."

The proper term would be "*unfolding*" or "*developing*" a power; but that is nothing new; a well-known chemical process.

But that for the development of this medicinal power, these triturations of crude substances are not the only and indispensable means, is admitted by Hahnemann in his recommendation not to triturate sulphur, but to make an alcoholic solution of it. This, when undiluted, is a very valuable remedial agent; again proving that the "shakes" can be dispensed with.

As regards the terms millionth, billionth, etc., they have been invented irrespectively of any indication in nature. These terms are inadmissible, and opposed to the true spirit of homœopathy, because they are liable to convey wrong impressions of the powers of drugs. Nature does not, and art cannot create "decillions," etc. Power in medicine cannot be measured by numerical calculation.

These terms are inconsistent even with Hahnemann's potency theory, and, in fact, absurd.

But, after all, the powers of development, and the process of diminution, have their limits; a line must be drawn somewhere, and that is to be found where matter ceases to give evidence of activity.

The last delusion that has grown out of this Hahnemannian

potence theory, is the invention of the so-called "high potences." They first made their appearance fifteen years ago, in Dr. Stapf's "Archiv," but were then treated with contempt, and continued to be so, until a certain Mr. Jenichen, in Mecklenburg, brought them into notice again, and induced two physicians to endorse his preparations as the only true and reliable ones.

The Hahnemannists [some at least] are lavish in their praises of those high potences; but the majority of homœopathic physicians have no faith in them.

A love for the marvellous is still working its mischief in several ways; but we are convinced that the critical element is becoming too powerful for it in Germany, and that the faith in the miraculous has seen its day. At the last annual congress of homœopathic physicians, held in Berlin, on the 9th August, 1847, the "high potences" were brought up. Dr. C. Müller, in his official report, as resident physician* at the Leipzig Hom. Hospital, stated, that during the preceding twelve months, the "high potences" had been fairly tried at the above hospital, and clearly proved to be useless, not having accomplished a single cure during that period, although the experiments were made with the veritable preparations of Mr. Jenichen, not by Dr. Müller alone, but by distinguished men like Wolff, Trinks, Hartmann and others.

Very fortunately for Homœopathy, this phantom of "high potences" begins to retreat more and more into the background, and, during the last session of the congress just alluded to, not a voice was publicly raised in their favor.

47. *The homœopathic physician should be familiar with the whole of medical science. He requires a knowledge of it in all its branches, and of all the collateral sciences, unless he would be a medical mechanic, whose art consists only in making dangerous experiments. May this truth be borne in mind by those who, without a due preliminary education, believe themselves qualified to practise homœopathy. Their ignorance and its fruits are laid to the charge of the system!*

The healing art is built upon the knowledge derived from the natural sciences.

Its nucleus is physiology; on this rest pathology, materia medica, and therapeutics. Therefore no link can be spared in

* In the absence of Dr. Hartmann, who is ill.

the chain without leading to prejudice, which, in the practice of medicine, is always fraught with more or less danger.

48. *Pathology has been too much lost sight of by Homœopathic physicians; and the assertion of some, that the totality of symptoms is the only guide for practice, is unjustifiable.*

49. *Comparative pathology is much to be wished for.*

We believe that the more widely the field of human knowledge opens before us, the more modest ought we to become in reference to that which is yet so distant from our perception.—But we may safely assert, that the natural sciences have made great progress since the comparative method has been pursued, which, in physiology especially, has shown us the way to light, though not yet the light itself. Accordingly, the same method should be applied to pathology, and researches for the laws of disease should be extended to animals. This would necessarily enjoin a study of nature beyond the walls of the library.

50. *Real and genuine crises occur, and should be observed. Nowhere do they appear so marked, as under a judicious treatment by specific remedies.*

By genuine crises we mean those phenomena in disease, which in the shape of expulsion of morbid secretions, show us that the re-action has commenced. The powers of nature alone often bring them about, without any medical interference. Hippocrates observed them under the expectant treatment, and recorded his observations for the information of the profession; but the latter has pursued a different course, by which nature has often been interfered with, and foiled, in her salutary efforts; so much so, that very little reliance can now be placed on what the text-books say with regard to the course, crisis and prognosis of a disease.

51. *Homœopathic remedies may be administered at any time of the day, if they are otherwise indicated.*

52. *Mental disorders are more successfully treated by the specific method than by any other.*

53. *Surgery should not seek its fame in the number and success of its operations, and in the neatness and dexterity of using the knife, but in rendering it unnecessary by a judicious administration of internal remedies.*

54. *The treatment of so-called surgical diseases with specific remedies, has in many instances obviated the necessity of an operation.*

Our views amount to this :

Homœopathy, in a therapeutical light, has a *future* which promises great good to art and science.

It is highly perfectible, but by no means perfect.

Until it shall have become so, we will acknowledge its fundamental principle as the best, but at the same time admit, that other methods possess remedial agents, which, if properly applied, can restore a diseased state to a healthy one, irrespective of the principle, "*similia similibus curantur.*"

58
ALLOPATHY, HAHNEMANNISM,

AND

RATIONAL HOMŒOPATHY.

COMPILED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. GRIESELICH,
PHYSICIAN TO THE STAFF OF THE ARMY, EDITOR OF THE "HYGIEA," ETC., ETC. ETC.

BY

A. C. BECKER, M.D.

NEW-YORK:
WILLIAM RADDE, 322 BROADWAY.

1848.

Results of Treatment

UPON THE PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN IN THE PRECEDING PAGES,
IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ROYAL HOSPITAL AT
HOF, BAVARIA, DURING EIGHTEEN MONTHS,

BY DR. SCHRÖN.

DISEASES.	No. of Cases	Cured	Improv'd	Died.	No. of ds. for all the Cases	Average No. of days for each Case.
Amenorrhœa ex refrigerio	2	2			19	9 1-2
Angina rheumatica	2	2			12	6
Angina tonsillaris	6	6			63	10 1-2
Asthma ex vitio cordis	2	1	1		23	11 1-2
Arthritis	6	6			52	8 3-4
Bronchitis chronica	4	3	1		165	41 1-4
Catarrhus pulmonum	2	2			10	5
Cholera sporadica	7	7			50	7 1-2
Chlorosis	1	1			12	12
Colica rheumatica	4	4			44	11
Convulsiones	3	2	1		59	19 2-3
Diarrhœa rheumatica	6	6			48	8
Dysenteria catarrhalis	2	2			12	6
Enteritis serosa	3	3			70	23 1-2
Erysipelas faciei	10	10			137	13 7-10
Febris gastrica	21	21			195	9 2-7
Febris interm. quotid.	2	2			16	8
“ “ tert.	8	8			80	10
Febris puerperalis	1	1			15	15
Febris rheumatica	50	50			418	8 9-25
Gastrodynia rheumatica	8	8			98	12 1-4
Gonorrhœa syphilitica	5	5			72	14 2-5
Hepatitis acuta	1	1			14	14
Hydrops anasarca ex refrig.	7	7			89	12 1-4
“ “ ex vitio cordis	6	2	4		185	30 5-6
Hydrothorax	2	1	1		40	20
Hæmoptysis	1	1			66	66
Ischias rheumatica	2	2			30	15
Mania	3	3			134	44 2-3
Marasmus senilis	4		3	1	56	14
Melæna	2	1		1	15	7 1-2
Melancholia	5	3	1	1	72	14 2-5
Morb. maculos. Werlhoffii	2	2			66	33
Pleuritis	21	21			117	5 4-7
Pneumonia	21	19		2	405	19 2-7
Phthisis pulm. purul.	4		3	1	127	42 1-3
Scabies	367	367			4624	12 ²²⁰ / ₃₆₇
Sycosis	8	8				
Syphilis	20	20				
Typhus abdm.	49	45		4	1390	30 6-9
Vertigo	2	1	1		18	9
Total,—	682	657	16	10		

The number of deaths being one and a half per cent.

ARMED FORCES
MEDICAL LIBRARY